

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-24 are pending in this application after this amendment. Claims 17-19 are withdrawn from consideration. Based upon the remarks included herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sameshima* (USP 6,115,568); and rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sameshima* in view of OKI Technical Review. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner asserts that *Sameshima* discloses holding member 19b including groove 19b as a position regulating means for regulating a position of the contacting member 5, when the contacting member 5 is detached from the supporting member 1 as shown in Fig. 2, and the contacting member is provided on the holding member. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the *Sameshima* reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to properly respond to Applicant's arguments included in the Reply filed. November 1, 2005. Specifically, Applicant argued that *Sameshima* failed to teach or suggest a detaching/attaching mechanism in which a contacting member is supported so as to be detachable/attachable from/to a supporting member, wherein, the holding member includes position regulating means for regulating a position of the contacting member with respect to the holding member, when the contacting member is detached from the supporting member, and when the contacting member is detached from the supporting member, the contacting member is provided on the holding member. This argument was further accompanied by specific teachings of *Sameshima*, which Applicant argued failed to rise to the level of anticipation

In response, the Examiner's arguments fail to address the teaching of *Samashima* at col. 9, lines 35-46, as discussed by the Applicant. The Examiner merely responds to this argument by asserting that the argument was a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In support of the argument, Applicant acknowledged specific teachings of the cited reference and argued that the teachings were insufficient to anticipate the specific claim element. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner properly respond to Applicant's argument included in Applicant's previous Reply that *Sameshima* fails to teach or suggest "a detaching/attaching mechanism in which a contacting member is supported so as to be detachable/attachable from/to a supporting member, wherein, the holding member includes position regulating means for regulating a position of the contacting member with respect to the holding member, when the contacting member is detached from the supporting member, and when the contacting member is detached from the supporting member, the contacting member is provided on the holding member" as claimed..

In addition to Applicant's previous argument, *Sameshima* discloses in col. 9, lines 35-46, that the intermediate transfer unit 5 is mounted on the drawing unit 17 solely by its own weight if the intermediate transfer belt 5a is not in contact with the photosensitive drum. However, Applicant maintains that these teachings of *Sameshima* are insufficient to teach or suggest the holding member including the position regulating means for regulating a position of the contacting member with respect to the holding member as claimed. As such, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of all arguments of record and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Request for Telephonic Interview

By this amendment, Applicant is filing concurrently herewith a Request for Telephonic Interview. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner, together with his Supervisor, contact the undersigned to discuss the outstanding rejections and further to discuss Applicant's arguments included herein prior to formally considering any arguments on the record.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3, and 6 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 6-8 and 12 include elements similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant